REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 14-20, and 22-24 are pending.

Claim 19 has been amended. Amendments to claim 19 have been made to futher define its subject matter.

Claim 21 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the Final Office Action dated November 3, 2006 ("Office Action"), the examiner has made rejections and objections which are hereby addressed as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10, 14-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry U.S. Patent No. 6,424,426 ("Henry"), in view of Akimoto, U.S. Patent No. 6,775,711 ("Akimoto"). Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections and further request reconsideration of the final rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants submit that the combination of Henry and Akimoto as presented by the examiner does not include all of the limitations of the claims in the instant patent application. First, Henry does not teach a business management software program as disclosed in the present application. Henry discloses tecnology related to the Inernet service MongoNet. MongoNet allows users to manually fill out a form with email addresses and scan such form into a fax machine for transmission to the email addresses provided in the form. It is the user that fills in the email address on the form, not a computer program. In the application disclosed herein, the business management software program adds a communication format to the electronic business transaction document.

Second, the Office Action has cited Akimoto as to cure the deficiency of determining a preferred communication format for each of the plurality of recipient parties of the business transaction. Akimoto teaches nothing on determining preferred communication formats. The Office Action cites Akimoto's Figure 8 and the associated description as teaching a

determination of preferred communication formats. Figure 8, and the description of Figure 8, discuss how various identification characters are used to manipulate the content being transmitted. "The mail address analize section 308 sends the analysis result to the determination section 309 [which] determines whether or not encryption processing is performed in later steps based on the analysis result." *See* Akimoto, Column 8, Lines 17-21 (describing of Figure 8). "In other words, when the mail adddress analyze section 308 detetects characters "A" to "C" after the identifirfcation character "@" the determination section 309 determines that processing according with these charactes is executed." *See* Akimoto, Column 8, Lines 30-35 (describing of Figure 8). Figure 7 is brings further understanding to Akimoto's identification characters. Figure 7 shows a column of various identification characters and a column of corresponding content processing operations.

"The identification character/processing table is stored in RAM 209. Here, as identification characters, characters A to C are used in addition to "@", and processing contents are determined in association with these identification characters, respectively. When the identification "A" is added, signature processing is carried out. When the identification "B" is added, encryption processing is carried out. When the identification "C" is added, JPEG conversion is carried out. The JPEG conversion is herein referred to processing for converting the MH file to the JPEG file." *See* Akimoto, Column 7, Lines 25-35 (describing of Figure 7).

The processing referred to in Akimoto (which is triggered by various identificiation characters) is for **content processing**, such as signature processing, encryption processing, JPEG conversion, etc. Therefore, the identification characters in Akimoto are used for formating the actual content that is to be transmitted, and give no indication of a preferred communication channel to be utilized. Therefore, Akimoto does not teach determining a preferred communication format for each of the plurality of recipient parties, wherein the format can be computer or non-computer communication format.

Furthermore, Applicants challenge the conclusion that the Henry-Akimoto combination teach the limitations of the present application. In particular, the proposed combination renders a different system than the system claimed in the present application. The system of Akimoto,

wherein identification characters are used in the destination address in order to provide content manipulation, combined with Henry would add new content functions so as to manipulate content of the fax document being sent. Such identification characters do not, however, work as communication format indicators. As such, Applicants strongly disagree that the Henry in view of Akimoto render claims 1-10, 14-20, and 22-24 obvious.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 1, 14 and 19 be withdrawn. Further, claims 2-10, 15-18 and 20 depend from independent claims 1, 14 and 19 respectively. Accordingly, Applicants also submit that the rejections of these claims also be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance, and such early action is respectfully requested. Should matters remain that the Examiner believes could be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (310) 586-6512.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s), or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number 50-2638, Deposit Account Name Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number 70325-040017 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 2, 2007

Pablo Tapia

Pablo E. Tapia
Reg. No. 52, 275

Customer Number 33717
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (310) 586-6512
Fax: (310) 586-0512
e-mail: tapiap@gtlaw.com
LA 126601099v1 8/21/2006